

MISSOURI STATE PENITENTIARY
REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

Open Session

August 24, 2005

Chairman Carr called the meeting called to order at 1:00 p.m.

The following Commission members were present: Bushmann, Carr, Meyer, Riddick, Schreiber, Sheehan, Wunderlich

The following commission members were absent: Callis, Mahfood, Peerson

- I. Approve minutes of May 25th and June 22 meetings.
Mr. Brzuchalski noted that a couple sentences should be corrected, in sequence only. He will give those changes to Charlotte and replacement pages will be available for members at the next meeting.
With no further comments, the minutes were approved by a motion from Mark Schreiber and seconded by John Sheehan.
- II. Presentations –
Margaret Conroy, Executive Director of the Missouri River Regional Library (MRRL) introduced her assistant, Betty Hagenhoff. She addressed the MSPR commissioners with an overview of the MRRL's Architect's version of the proposed site. She noted that it is the strong belief of the community that the Library should be centrally located or in the same proximity of the current library. MRRL has chosen their site to be in the Public Service Campus on the MSPR site. Ms. Conroy focused on what is needed inside the building (approx 80,000 s.f.).
Specifically:

Teen area	Study Rooms
Meeting Rooms	Reading area
Drive-up window	Technology Space
Public cooperative work space	

Option space: Staff has asked for a small auditorium to be added; however cost may not allow.

The preliminary budget estimate is approximately \$28m, based on the MRRL's ability to purchase the land from the MSPR Commission at a very low cost. MRRL would assume the responsibility for demolition and site preparation (estimate: \$2.5m) The MRRL is not certain if the entire \$28m will be publicly funded. Some funding will come from the Library Foundation. They will know toward the end of the year how large the bond issue will be.
Key Issue: Parking – MRRL needs 200 spaces
 - 1) how much will be available
 - 2) what type

Ms. Conroy continued with a walk-thru of how the building would be situated; what would be visible to the public when approaching the building, such as, the drop-off area, walk way to the courtyard, drive-up window. The back of the building would make the most of the northern exposure, so as to provide adequate lighting and

provide a public view of the river. It is also hopeful to have a patio for public events, including some reading rooms by the outside balcony on the second floor.

Parking Lot: While Ms. Conroy reminded the members again that this is only a preliminary plan. She showed a sample of a completely surfaced parking lot. The public is totally against a parking structure, particularly underground.

Discussion:

Bushmann: What size is the surface are?

Conroy: The foot print itself is 80,000 s.f., assuming 2 floors.

Sheehan: The land would be transferred at normal cost and your financial budget, at \$2.5m, includes the cost of the remediation, cleaning, and raking the site?

Conroy: Yes. We are hopeful that there are grants available for some of this. The DNR folks have visited us numerous times and we are in hopes they will be able to lend some financial assistance.

Sheehan: Regarding the infrastructure, is there anything your budget regarding the participation of cost of the streets, sewage and utilities?

Conroy: Sewage and utilities, yes. Not the street. We are assuming the city would put in the street from Lafayette all the way out to the round-a-bout.

Brzuchalski: The city has continued to express an interest and desire to participate in those street projects and the utility infrastructure project. The sewer main is at the base of the block. There would be no additional sewer. The water main is a block away. Missouri American Water Co. just installed a new 12" main. They would probably fund a waterline connection based on the anticipated revenue being generated by the MRLL usage.

Riddick: Commented that the parking should be looked at very closely. A mass of 200 cars is not an aesthetic appearance.

Schreiber: the architect should be aware that the design concept should fit in with the historical nature of the site.

Sheehan: Has your architect or board considered an alternate site?

Conroy: No. this is the most visible site and has the right amount of acreage and access.

Bushmann: Have you done a study concerning the existing building and how it might be converted into a jail.

Conroy: No the County may have in an interest. It is expected to sell for over \$1m. It was appraised in '02 for \$3m.

Brzuchalski: What kind of time line are you on for additional input from the MSPR Commission or other folks in the community?

Conroy: We have three design charrettes coming up this Fall – September, October and November. The architect will then come back in January with a more conceptual design of what the buildings will look like. We will go to the voters in April to ask for approval of a bond issue to build the new library. We will need – before the end of the year- a commitment from the MSPR that you will sell us the land. We don't want to lease. Assuming the bond issue is approved in April, it would be approximately 18 months before groundbreaking.

III. Conflict of Interest Policy – Counsel Pamela Henrickson

Ms. Henrickson informed the members that the Conflict of Interest Policy prohibits the MSPR members from having discussions from *any* potential proposer regarding the redevelopment. All questions should be referred to Charlie Brzuchalski.

Because of an inadequate quorum at the last meeting the revised Conflict of Interest was not approved.

The changes were reviewed, and new policies were distributed to the members.

Mr. Sheehan offered a motion to approve. It was seconded by Mr. Schreiber.

Those in favor: Bushmann, Carr, Meyer, Riddick, Schreiber, Sheehan, Wunderlich

Opposed: none

Absent: Callis, Mahfood, Peerson

IV. Insurance Coverage – Counsel Pamela Henrickson

Ms. Henrickson reported that she has had several conversations with MoPERM.

While they are not sure how to approach the issue, they are also short-staffed and will not be providing quotes to anyone in less than 90 days. Ms. Henrickson advised that the Commission should continue to work with MoPERM. She has also had discussions with the office of Risk Management staff and they will speak with commercial insurance companies to see what they have to offer. Because the facility is not occupied, poses a huge problem.

Discussion:

Riddick: If there is no decision and either the Library or Fed. Court House start up, how does this affect the progress?

Henrickson: We will separate the parcels and say we are not responsible. The question is how the insurance requirement will affect the tourism contract.

Sheehan: Are we 30 days away from a quote?

Henrickson: MoPERM is giving 90 days to current clients. They have indicated to me mid-December.

Mosby: The state wants to rehab one for the buildings for the Dept. of Corrections. If the Commission could turn it over to the state, that wouldn't have to be insured.

Henrickson: Is it the consensus of the Commission that you want me to only be looking for coverage on the two buildings that are to be saved?

Carr: From everyone's comments here today, yes.

Housing Units 1 and 4 – to be demolished

Housing Units 2 and 3 – keep outside – refurbish inside

V. Caretaking Update – Director David Mosby

We are operating an Office of Administration carpool below the garage. This is only temporary. We are researching the idea of possibly installing a "jiffy lube" in that garage with temporary equipment and a lift for on-site maintenance. There is also a possibility of acquiring a grant in order to provide an ethanol tank for fueling the state cars, in an effort to save the state many dollars.

VI. Project Status – Charlie Brzuchalski

The Quality Based Selection master planning has been delayed somewhat, because of time dedicated to some property purchases in relation to the Health Lab project. I hope to get back on course next week.

Discussion:

Bushmann: Are you purchasing some property that is technically outside the existing boundaries?

Brzuchalski: As part of the Health Lab project, we had intended to make some additional property purchases along Capitol Avenue. Some vacant lots have become available and we'd had an opportunity to acquire those pieces, with the assistance of Ms. Henrickson

Bushmann: Would that also be a possibility for other properties; such as those along State Street?

Brzuchalski: I believe the Bill states that we can only receive property by gift or bequest.

Sheehan: Can you bring us up to date on the work being done by the East Side Neighborhood Association and the Rex Whitton Expressway Study.

Brzuchalski: The Expressway Study is moving ahead. An initial report will be ready some time this fall. The City's Central East End Neighborhood plan is in the final edit version and is ready to be submitted to the city for final receipt and approval.

VIII. Logo – Letterhead

Charlie Brzuchalski and Mark Schreiber distributed the latest, revised sample of the MSP Redevelopment Commission letterhead.

Mr. Bushmann offered a motion to approve and Mr. Wunderlich seconded the motion to approve the logo as the official letterhead logo.

By a voice vote, all were in favor.

With no further business Mr. Bushmann offered a motion to close the Open Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schreiber.

These minutes were approved October 27, 2005.